

BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
Website: <http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/>
(916) 653-8007

**Management Committee Meeting Report**

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
December 7, 2010
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: **Resources Building**
15th Floor, Room 1506-12
Sacramento, California

Meeting Attendance

Committee Members Doug Piirto (Chair), Pam Giacomini, Tom Walz; George Gentry (Board Executive Officer); Doug Ferrier (Forest Slopes Management); Dr. Helge Eng, Dr. Russ Henly, Bill Snyder, Allen Robertson (Department of Forestry & Fire Protection); Lorna Dobrovolny (Department of Fish & Game); Frank Mulhair, Bill Key (California Licensed Foresters Association); Charles Greenlaw, Dan Weldon (Alliance 4 Family Forests); Larry Camp (Forest Landowners of California); Mike Jani (Jackson Demonstration State Forest Advisory Group/Humboldt and Mendocino Redwood Companies); Addie Jacobson (Ebbetts Pass Forest Watch); Staci Heaton (Regional Council of Rural Counties); Gary Rynearson (Green Diamond Resource Company).

~ Items Appear in the order in which they were discussed by the Committee ~

Agenda Item #1: Discussion of Prospective Interim Guidance for Cal Fire Management Plan Implementation During Period of Board Review of Jackson Advisory Group Recommendations.

Staff summarized the pending “new interim management period” that will begin as the Board undertakes review of the Jackson Advisory Group’s (JAG) recommendations beginning in February 2011. As thorough review of the JAG recommendations will take an indeterminate period of time, the Department sought direction from the Board at the November 2010 Committee and full Board meetings as to the manner in which timber operations should continue during this time. At that time, Department staff identified the following three possible options for “interim period” management guidance:

Option 1. Continue to manage under the Board approved 2008 management plan (FMP) without additional constraint.

Under this option, the projected average annual harvest level would be 20 MMBF (FMP projection for period 2011-2014).

Option 2. Implement the 2008 FMP while incorporating Department recommended “temporary measures.” [**DEPARTMENT’S PREFERRED OPTION**].

“Temporary measures” would include:

- Exclusive use of conservative silvicultural methods such as selection and commercial thinning (unless an approved research and demonstration project requires otherwise).
- Allowance for JAG review of all proposed Timber Harvesting Plans (THPs). Note: the JAG has completed their review of all plans prepared in 2010 which include three THPs already conforming to these temporary measures.

- The projected average annual harvest level for the period 2011-2014 would be 12.5 MMBF.
- Approximately 1,000-1,300 acres would be allowed for harvest annually.

Option 3. Extend the initial implementation period interim silvicultural guidelines as follows:

- Post-harvest conifer stocking (basal area) levels will be approximately 70 percent or greater of pre-harvest levels.
- Average tree size as determined by quadratic mean stem diameter will be approximately equal to or greater than pre-harvest levels.
- Efforts will be made to limit the extent of harvest in areas that have had little or no harvest entry since 1925, or that currently have greater than 10 trees/acre greater than 30" in diameter (see FMP Map Figure 8), particularly where those areas have not already had work done to prepare timber harvesting plans.
- The projected average annual harvest level under the interim guidelines would continue to be 12 MMBF.

Assistant Deputy Director (Resource Protection and Improvement), Dr. Russ Henly and State Forest Program Manager, Dr. Helge Eng provided additional clarification on the Department's preferred option. Committee Members and participants engaged in vigorous discussion of the elements in the option, the result of which was a number of revisions to the option.

At the conclusion of discussion, Member Giacomini made a motion to recommend that the full Board endorse the Department's preferred option as revised by the Committee. Member Walz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

FULL BOARD ACTION ITEM:

The Committee recommends that the Board direct the Department to implement the 2008 Forest Management Plan with the following additional provisions from this point forward and until conclusion of the Board's deliberations on the Jackson Advisory Group's report and recommendations:

- **All stands designated as available for harvest in the 2008 Forest Management Plan will remain available for harvest.**
- **Conservative silvicultural methods such as selection and commercial thinning will be used exclusively (unless an approved research and demonstration project requires otherwise).**
- **The Jackson Advisory Group (JAG) will continue to review all proposed Timber Harvesting Plans (THPs).**
- **Under the initial 3-year implementation period constraints, the projected average annual harvest level was 12 MMBF. Under the Board approved 2008 Forest Management Plan, the projected average annual harvest level was between 20 and 25, not to exceed 35 MMBF. In this interim period, it is anticipated that the projected average annual harvest levels will range between 12 and 35 MMBF.**
- **It is anticipated that approximately 1,000-1,500 acres will be harvested annually.**

Agenda Item #3: Continuing Discussion of Modified Timber Harvesting Plan (MTHP) Regulatory Proposal for Permitting of Fuel Hazard Reduction Projects.

Staff introduced the topic and presented a revised draft cumulative impacts assessment checklist for inclusion as an element of MTHP filings. Staff then deferred to Deputy Chief for Environmental Protection, Allen Robertson for his perspective on the utility of the proposed checklist. Mr. Robertson identified a number of shortcomings of the checklist and questioned its usefulness and application to the rule proposal. Following discussion on this point, Member Giacomini suggested that the proposed rule plead language could be revised to address the RPF's responsibility for cumulative impacts assessment and alleviate the necessity for a separate checklist process. This revision would require the RPF to certify that a cumulative impacts assessment had been conducted under the guidance of existing Forest Practice Rule provisions and Board Technical Rule Addendum Number 2, but would not require the RPF to submit this work in writing as a part of the MTHP submission. Following discussion, staff was directed to make this edit to the draft rule plead (as well as two others), and to circulate the revised draft to Committee participants as quickly as possible for their further review and consideration.

At the conclusion of discussion, Staff was directed to complete the following tasks with the objective of presenting the full Board with a draft rule proposal at the January 2011 meeting:

- **Staff to follow-up with Cal Fire wildlife biologist, Bob Motroni and DFG biologist, Lorna Dobrovoly on the WHR modeling effort in support of the MTHP proposal.**
- **Staff to make three revisions to draft rule plead.**
- **Staff to revise Initial Statement of Reasons to include relevant portions of fuel treatment simulations report prepared by Cal Fire's Jeff Leddy, along with other previously identified revisions and inclusions.**
- **Staff to ensure that draft documents are posted for public review on the Board's website.**

NOTE: DISCUSSION OF ALL OTHER AGENDA ITEMS WAS DEFERRED TO THE JANUARY 2011 MEETING.

Possible Committee Agenda Items for January 2011 Meeting

Chairman Piirto identified the following agenda items for possible inclusion on the January 2011 Agenda:

1. Review of draft NTMP Growth and Yield Guidelines Document.
2. Continuing Discussion of Modified Timber Harvesting Plan (MTHP) Regulatory Proposal for Fuel Hazard Reduction Projects. **Possible Action Item.**
3. Presentation of Draft Board Policy Statement Regarding Cal Fire Implementation of AB 2351. **Possible Action Item.**
4. Status Report on Draft Soquel Demonstration State Forest Management Plan Update and Reconstitution of the Soquel Advisory Committee.
5. New and Unfinished Business:
 - a. SYP Renewal Update
 - b. February 2011 Agenda Items and Review of 2011 Committee Priorities

Management Committee Priorities for 2010

PRIORITY 1:

Evaluation/Monitoring of Forest Practice Rules:

1. **Sustained Yield Plan (SYP) Review:** *Rules for SYP extension adopted. Comprehensive review of SYP and implementation of extension, 2010. Objective: Complete by end of 2010*
2. **Non-Industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP) Review:** *Ongoing review of issues. Department Draft NTMP Growth and Yield Guidelines document posted on Department website—currently in use by Department plan review personnel. Review Guidelines, February 2010. Objective: Complete by mid 2010*
3. **(D09 #12) Modified THP for fuel reduction:** *The Board could make changes to increase the utility of an MTHP, e.g., expanding the allowable acreage, limiting the application to small timberland owners and modifying certain limitations, or, as is currently being considered, focus a category of MTHPs on fuels reduction. Phase 7. Stakeholder input. Discussion of monitoring, photo points. Objective: Complete by end of 2010*

Demonstration State Forests Management:

4. **Jackson (Liaison to JAG):** *Harvesting began in 2009. Nearing end of interim period; will need to consider revisions to management by end of 2010.*
5. **Soquel:** *Updated Management Plan under development. Objective: Management Plan Update and CEQA coverage to be completed by Spring of 2011.*

PRIORITY 2:

6. **(D09 #15)14 CCR § 1092.04(d)** [in part], A Notice of Intent shall include the following information: **(4)** The acres proposed to be harvested. **(5)** The regeneration methods and intermediate treatments to be used. 14 CCR § 1092.04(d)(4) requires stating the acres proposed to be harvested. Board should amend this paragraph to include all acres where **timber operations** will occur. Board should consider the current definition of logging area and the lack of a definition of plan area. 14 CCR § 1092.04(d)(5) This paragraph may not capture all possible treatments that may occur under a plan (special prescriptions, road right-of-way, or fuelbreak.)
7. **(D09 #4)14 CCR § 913.11(a) [933.11(a), 953.11(a)].** Board should consider forming a technical working group to consider changes to existing MSP rule to provide more concrete standards for the MSP demonstration per 14 CCR § 913.11(a) [933.11(a), 953.11(a)]. Consider implications for assuring AB 32 targets.

PRIORITY 3:

14 CCR § 912.9, Board of Forestry Technical Rule Addendum No. 2:

8. *Categories need to be expanded to include climate change and effect on fire threat from the proposed harvest. (To Policy Committee)*

9. *Maps need to show all the past, currently proposed, and likely future THPs layered into one map. (Phase III of ASP review)*
10. *Biological assessment areas and proportional mitigations, expansion of consideration of non-conifer resource. (Phase III of ASP review)*
11. *Is mitigation required proportional to the impacts? E.g., small harvest operations required to utilize the same mitigations as industrial operations. (Phase III of ASP review)*
12. *Consider adding adjacent watersheds for evaluating past, present and future projects..(Phase III of ASP review)*
13. *Assessment of impacts made project by project, need landscape approach. California State Wildlife Action Plan not being adhered to: "Using the best-available science, extent, pattern, and pace for timber-harvest in a forest watershed". <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/WAP/>.(Phase III of ASP review)*
14. *CEQA case law states that where the environmental baseline demonstrates existing significant impacts, this heightens, rather than reduces, the scrutiny that must be applied in the resulting cumulative impact assessment. The Board of Forestry, Cal Fire, DFG, Water Boards, and the scientific community should begin to address CWEs by developing detailed guidance documents on the subject. (to Policy Committee discussion regarding WQ policy issues)*